

## REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in conjunction with the simultaneously filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and in response to the final Office Action dated March 21, 2007, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by June 21, 2007.

Claims 15-20 are pending in this application.

In the final Office Action, claims 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,756,104 to Bier et al. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bier et al in view of EP 1,162,054 A1 to Ikawa. Claim 4 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bier et al.

In the present amendment, claims 8-14 have been canceled, and new independent claims 15 and 16 have been added to more clearly define the present invention over the art of record.

Independent claims 15 and 16 define more specifically the relationship of the cutting force to the variable glass sheet thickness, which is not disclosed or suggested by the Bier reference. The Applicants disagree with the Examiner's analysis that Bier discloses that the cutting pressure is varied according to the thickness of the glass. The analysis of the Bier disclosure in column 2, lines 6-8, which only discloses that "score lines of predetermined depth are obtained, despite small variations in the thickness of the glass", appears to be an

impermissible analysis that “jumps to a desired conclusion”, which is based on knowledge of the present application.

In addition, the Examiner in the final rejection cites portions of the background section of Bier et al in column 1. However, the background section is not the invention and problems can be posed in the background section, which are not solved by the invention or only peripherally related to the invention.

While Bier teaches that the cutting pressure should be increased during cutting a blank 64 for a windshield as the cutting tool traverses the periphery of the blank during scoring, Bier in column 3, lines 35-53 merely teaches that a greater cutting pressure is applied at the corners of the glass sheet. This disclosure does not suggest that the thickness of the glass sheet varies at the corners.

New claim 16 defines more specifically that the sensor of the present invention is a “glass-sheet-thickness measuring sensor”. The sensor 10 of Ikawa et al is not suitable for measuring the thickness of a glass sheet, but is disclosed only for the use of measuring the thickness of “car skin”.

Newly added dependent claims 17-20 define features of the previously claimed “controller” element that were defined in former claims 8-12.

Because new independent claims 15 and 16 include features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, the Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over the art of record. MPEP section 2131 requires that “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a

single prior art reference”, and that “the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim”. Here, these standards are not met by the cited references.

The application in its amended state is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

**/ Michael J. Striker /**

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700